

To: Tapia, Cecilia[Tapia.Cecilia@epa.gov]; Doherty, Paul[Doherty.Paul@epa.gov]
Cc: Whitley, Christopher[Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov]
From: Johnson, James
Sent: Thur 7/17/2014 4:05:29 PM
Subject: RE: ACTION REQUIRED: NIOSH Letter to Pattonville Fire Department

.....
>>>>>>

As I read it, this letter is from NIOSH to the General President of the IAFF on behalf of IAFF Local 2665. It is not addressed to the EPA or seeks an EPA response at this time. It appears that NIOSH is trying to address the health and safety concerns of Pattonville fire fighters when responding to emergencies at Bridgton and West Lake Landfills.

NIOSH identified several potential hazards as well as planning issues for the local IAFF, again by this letter, these are not EPA issues at this time. The issues that NIOSH brought up in regard to the SSSE, RIM and other issues as reported by Thalhamer, should not be addressed by EPA at this time. In my opinion, it would put us in a "he said, she said" type situation. With our experts versus their experts scenario. Media wise, we are never going to "look good".

In short, NIOSH stated:

The details of a proposed isolation barrier have not been determined. The purpose of the isolation barrier is to stop the SSE from entering Area 1 of OU-1.

Results from air monitoring from the Bridgeton Landfill and the SSE in the south quarry by the MDNR have not found elevated airborne contaminant levels, nor were the majority of the 62 volatile organic compounds tested by air monitoring detected at those same levels.

The incident response plans currently rely upon the landfill operator to determine incident status and whether outside assistance is required. And the February incident investigation was handled internally by Republic Services.

The Pattonville Fire District is taking appropriate precautions when responding to fire calls at the Bridgeton Landfill.

Organizations involved in incident responses involving the SSE in the West Lake Landfill site can best set priorities and assess the feasibility of our recommendations for the specific situations encountered.

EPA can best state the above reasons in its response to this letter. The conclusions reached by NIOSH are currently being addressed in some fashion by EPA, MDNR, Republic, The City of Bridgeton, etc. The letter again, doesn't ask EPA for a response and it appears that NIOSH has closed this item with the IAFF. Just my thoughts.

From: Tapia, Cecilia
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 1:13 PM
To: Johnson, James; Doherty, Paul

Subject: FW: ACTION REQUIRED: NIOSH Letter to Pattonville Fire Department
Importance: High

Since you participate on the Monday calls with Dr. Gunn's office

From: Whitley, Christopher
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Carey, Curtis; Peterson, Mary; Tapia, Cecilia; Field, Jeff; Gravatt, Dan; Hoefer, David
Subject: ACTION REQUIRED: NIOSH Letter to Pattonville Fire Department
Importance: High

The attached letter from NIOSH to the Pattonville Fire Department is now circulating to media, and at least one outlet (KWMU Public Radio) is asking for our official reaction.

The purpose of this email is to initiate discussion as to what response, if any, we should provide to KWMU and any future media inquiries. It looks as though this letter will be part of the CAG agenda on 7/21.

Seeking your collective input ASAP so that we can make a timely response to the press.

Chris Whitley

Public Affairs Specialist

U.S. EPA Region 7 Office of Public Affairs

11201 Renner Boulevard

Lenexa, KS 66219

913-551-7394